

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the restriction requirement the Examiner delineated the inventions as set forth on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action.

In response to the Restriction Requirement Applicants elect without traverse Group II. The Examiner further required the election of a single species. Accordingly, Applicants elect Example 14, also without traverse.

Further, Applicants reserve the right to file divisional applications on the non-elected subject matter, if so desired, and be accorded the benefit of the filing date of the parent application.

Divisional applications filed thereafter should not be subject to double-patenting ground of rejection, 35 U.S.C. § 121, *In re Joyce* (Comr. Pats. 1957) 115 USPQ 412.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are independently or patentably distinct and there would be a serious burden placed on the Examiner if restriction is not required (M.P.E.P. § 803).

Applicants make no statement regarding the patentable distinctness of the groups but note that for the restriction to be proper there must be patentable differences.

Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and an early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Paul J. Killos
Registration No. 58,014

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)